DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 281 CS 506 149

AUTHOR Seiffert, Mark A.; Riffle, Sharon
TITLE Communication Apprehension and Willingness To Communicate as Related to Perceptions of Communication Competence.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (73rd, Boston, MA, November 5-8, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; Behavior Patterns; *Communication Apprehension; Communication Research; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Communication; *Interpersonal Competence; Social Cognition
IDENTIFIERS *Willingness to Communicate

ABSTRACT

Defining "willingness to communicate" as the degree to which an individual will talk to others in various situations, a study was conducted to test the hypothesis that a linear composite of the dimensions of communication apprehension and willingness to communicate is significantly related to a linear composite of the dimensions of communication competence. Approximately 300 undergraduate students completed three survey instruments that measured (1) willingness to communicate; (2) communication apprehension; and (3) communication competence. Data were analyzed using canonical correlation analysis and the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. Results supported the hypothesis. A relationship appeared to exist between communication apprehension, willingness to communicate, and perceptions of interpersonal communication competence. Most of the weight for those relationships, however, fell with dyadic and group apprehension. Willingness to communicate appeared to have an effect, but the effect was not large. (Copies of the three survey instruments, tables of data, and 30 references are appended.) (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED294281

Communication Apprehension and Willingness to Communicate as Related To Perceptions of Communication Competence

Mark A. Seiffert Sharon Riffle

Abstract

The study of Communication Apprehension has provided several important conclusions through the years on the effects that the construct has on individuals. This study expands those findings by examining the relatively new construct of Willingness to Communicate and Communication Apprehension as it pertains to the perceptions that other's have about an individuals communication competence. This investigation found that a linear composite of Communication Apprehension dimensions and Willingness to Communicate was significantly related to a linear composite of the dimensions of communication competence as reported by others. Seventeen percent of the variance was accounted for by the apprehension and willingness composite when examining communication competence.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mark Seiffert
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS506149

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION AND WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE AS RELATED TO PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE

Mark A. Seiffert
Doctoral Student
Departments of Curriculum & Instruction and Communication Studies
West Virginia University
130 Armstrong Hall
Morgantown, WV 26506.
304-293-3905

Sharon Riffle, M.A.
Graduated 1986
Department of Communication Studies
West Virginia University
130 Armstrong Hall
Morgantown, WV 26506
304-293-3905

Presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Communication Apprehension Division, at Boston, November, 1987.

ED280419

Communication may be the most important of all human activities. How well we communicate, how willing we are to communicate, and how apprehensive we are about the process of communicating have profound effects throughout our entire lives. The continuing examination of the interrelationship among these concepts has been the focus of much scholarly attention.

One pervasive concept is communication apprehension. Communication apprehension has been conceptualized as a trait-like anxiety which effects a person's communication behaviors (McCroskey, 1970; 1977; 1978) and has been defined as "a relatively enduring, personality type orientation toward a given mode of communication across a wide variety of contexts" (McCroskey, 1981, pg. 10). Communication apprehension is primarily a cognitive construct that is accessed through self-report approaches (McCroskey, 1981). The cognitive aspect of communication apprehension is only part of several constructs that can be seen as effecting the amount that individuals communicate. To more completely understand how much people communicate, and why, another construct (as well as communication apprehension) has been proposed.

Willingness to communicate (McCroskey & Baer, 1985) is the degree to which an individual will talk to others in a variety of communication situations. The construct of willingness to communicate is attempting to tap into the variability of talking behaviors among people (McCroskey and Baer,1985; McCroskey & Richmond,1985). McCroskey and Richmond (1985) outline the concept,

> "people differ dramatically from one another in the degree to which they actually do talk. Some people talk very little, they tend to speak only when spoken to--and sometimes not even then. Others tend to verbalize almost constantly. Many people talk more in some contexts than in others. Most people talk more to some receivers than they do others. (p. 1)"

In their conceptualization of the construct McCroskey and Baer (1985) note that how willing a person is to communicate is dependant on many situational constraints. But what the construct is attempting to access is the underlying generalizability of people's perceptions of their own behaviors in communicating. The amount, and to what degree, we perceive our communication with others should be an important indicant of our actual interpersonal behaviors.

The argument that communication apprehension and willingness to communicate may be different titles for similar constructs certainly appears important at this point. McCroskey and Baer (1985) found a negative correlation of .52 when this relationship was examined. This seems to indicate that while the two concepts have similar groundings, they are also unique in the cognitive structures that they are representing. McCroskey and Richmond go on to explain that "Communication apprehension measures are not presumed to be direct measures of global predisposition to approach or avoid communication. (p. 3)". Fear or anxiety may be a precurser to willingness to communicate, but does not encompass all of the underlying concepts for why an individual will or will not communicate. A person may be unwilling to communicate for other reasons than anxiety. Potential lack of interpersonal reward for communicating could be a reason (Burgoon, 1976). This author, for instance, is not afraid of snakes, but is not overly enthusiastic about handling them. The same may be true for some people as far as communication is concerned. With this in mind a combination of communication apprehension and willingness to communicate should provide a powerful research tool for examining human behavior.

One area of human behavior that scholars have been examining is communication competence. The questions of how to conceptualize and measure communication competence has recently intensified in the field of human communication. Traditionally competence has been examined as a self-reported

trait-based construct. More recently, however, some researchers have begun to look at competence from an other-report, state-like orientation (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984).

Along these lines communication competence may be conceptualized as reflecting the attributions of communicators, which in turn are based on the observations of behaviors in context, relational history, individual perceptions, and perceived traits of self and other(s) (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984). When communication competence is conceptualized as being observed through the eyes of others, the question arises: to what degree do trait-like constructs affect those perceptions?

Wiemann (1977) provided a comprehensive framework of the five basic dimensions of communication competence: "(1) affiliation/support, (2) social relaxation, (3) empathy, (4) behavioral flexability, and (5) interaction management skills" (p. 197). These dimensions have been replicated when looking at communication competence as observed by others (Seiffert, 1985; Wheeless & Seiffert, 1986). These five emphasize what dimensions must be addressed when researching communication competence. They also provide the basic grounding from which the effects of communication apprehension and related constructs may affect the perceptions of communication competence by others.

Previous research has shown communication apprehension to be inversely related to dominance (Mortensen, Armston, & Lustig, 1977), arguementativeness (Infante & Rancer, 1982), assertiveness (Jones & Russell, 1982), social responsiveness and attentiveness (Cegala, Savage, Bruner, & Conrad, 1982). But communication apprehension has been found to be positively related to empathy (Davis, 1983), avoidance of risk taking (Rocklin & Revelle, 1981), and intolerance of ambiguity (Lashbrook, Lashbrook, Bacon, & Salinger, 1979). From this review it could be assumed that a lack of dominance and assertiveness may

lead to adverse effects on an individual's ability to manage interactions. A lack of responsiveness and attentiveness may indicate that a highly apprehensive individual would be rated as less supportive and empathetic. But empathy as a whole has also been positively related to communication apprehension which may indicate that an attentive listener, in some circumstances, may be perceived positively.

Research on others' perceptions of anxiousness may be even more indicative of how communication apprehension as perceived by others effects communication competence. The highly anxious person has been seen as less friendly, attentive, and relaxed (Pilkonis, 1977; Porter, 1982) which has implications for the competence dimensions of affiliation/support and social relaxation. High anxious people were also perceived as less assertive and responsive (Knutson & Lashbrook, 1976; Kearney & McCroskey, 1980), which implies a negative relation with the dimensions of empathy and interaction management, and the highly anxious person is also perceived as non-immediate, detached, and submissive (Burgoon & Koper, 1983) which indicates a probable negative correlation with all of the dimensions of communication competence.

The willingness to communicate construct has been found to be only moderately correlated with communication apprehension (McCroskey & Baer,1985). It has also been found to be correlated with self-esteem and self-reported communication competence (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986b), though subsequent analyses have shown that in such investigations self-esteem provided no unique variance. Willingness to communicate has also been found to be correlated with anomie, alienation, and introversion (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986a) at slight to moderate levels. These could indicate that willingness to communicate will be correlated with other's reported estimations of competence. Through the correlations with alienation and introversion it would be expected that

willingness to communicate may be most strongly correlated with empathy, behavioral flexibility, and interaction management.

However significant the correlations may be, they may not be very large. Daly and Stafford (1984) have examined the problem with correlating personality and behavioral variables. Past research has often shown that these correlations are very slight; however, they are still significant (Daly, 1978; Jaccard & Daly, 1980). Further confounding the size of possible correlations are the findings by Kelly(1983) that have shown that outside observers often cannot tell the difference, on the basis of skills, between individuals with different levels of apprehension. It is logical to assume that any research that looks at trait constructs and other-reports will be mediated along the same lines. Hopefully, the combination of both communication apprehension, a self-report of anxiety about communicating, and willingness to communicate, a self-report of tendencies to communicate across situations, will provide a more powerful research tool for the examination of issues along these lines.

Therefore, to evaluate how the traits of communication apprehension and willingness to communicate effect the perception of communication competence by others the following hypothesis is posited:

> H: A linear composite of the dimensions of communication apprehension and willingness to communicate is significantly related to a linear composite of the dimensions of communication competence as reported by others.

METHODS

A total of 305 students enrolled in undergraduate communication classes at a medium sized eastern university completed the instruments employed in this study. Respondents completed the PRCA-24 (McCroskey, 1982) and the WTC-20 (McCroskey &

Baer, 1985). The same students were then asked to have two friend and two acquaintences, one of each sex, fill out a communication competence scale (Seiffert, 1985) referencing the subject. Instruments were completed with no personal identification and the competence measures were returned in sealed envelopes to ensure anonymity and to increase the possibility of an unbiased response. Approximatly half the subjects were male and half were female.

Measures

Willingness to Communicate

The WTC scale (McCroskey & Baer, 1985) is a 12-item instrument with 8 filler items, the actual measure having a total of twenty. The scale and scoring procedure is reported in figure 1 (McCroskey & Baer, 1985, p. 8). Previous internal (alpha) reliabilities reported for the total scale have been .92 (McCroskey & Baer, 1985), .91 (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986b), and .91 (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986a). Subcontext reliabilities have renged from .65 to .82. For this study the reliability for the total scale was .89 while the reliabilities for the subcontexts varied from .79 to .87.

Communication Apprehension

The Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24; McCroskey, 1982; see figure 2) was used to measure communication apprehension. The reliabilities for the four subscores of dyad, group, meeting, and public were .82, .86, .89, and .87.

Communication Competence

The communication competence scale for this study was developed along Wiemann's five dimensions of competence (see Seiffert, 1985; Wheeless & Seiffert, 1986). But in consideration of the contextual aspect of competence a principle components factor analysis with oblique rotation using all other reports was performed (n=1390) to secure the factor structure. Previously this instrument

has shown a five-factor structure consisting of Immediacy, with a reliability of .82; Composure (social relaxation), with a reliability of .81; Empathy, with a reliability of .68; Interaction Management, with a reliability of .79; and Behavioral Flexibility, reliability of .74. Using an eigenvalue cutoff of 1.0 and the scree test, the factor analysis produced a four factor solution accounting for 65 percent of the varience (see table 1). For this study the dimensions of behavioral flexability and interaction management collapsed into one factor that was named adaptability (items 1-4, 9-14, 32) and had a reliabiltiy of .89. The other factors were Immediacy (items 18-24, 28, 33, 39, 40) with a reliability of .89, Empathy (items 5-8, 17, 25-27, 36, 37) with a reliability of .88, and Social Relaxation (items 16, 29-31, 34) with a reliability of .84. One item was excluded for not meeting the minimum loading criterion of .40. Final scores for communication competence were arrived at by averaging the four other-reports into a single score.

Statistical Analysis

The research hypothesis was tested using canonical correlation analysis. Individual relationships among the variables were further examined using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. Alpha level was set at .05 for all analyses.

RESULTS

Results of the canonical correlation supported the research hypothesis and produced one significant canonical root. The cannonical correlation between the 'predictor' variables (4 subcomponents of communication apprehension and willingness to communicate) and the 'criterion' variables (4 dimensions of communication competence) was significant ($F = 3.60$, $df = 20/983$, $p > .0001$; see table two). The linear composite of (1) dyad, (2) group, (3) meeting, (4) public, and (5) WTC was significantly correlated ($Rc = .41$) with a linear composite of the factors of communication competence (immediacy, social

relaxation, empathy, and adaptability). The apprehension and WTC composite shared 17 percent variance with the communication competence composite. Apprehension in dyads, groups, and meetings were the predominant correlates with their composite with public apprehension and WTC contributing moderately. The communication competence composite was highly contributed by social relaxation and moderately by adaptability. Affect contributed slightly to the composite and empathy contributed the least.

Pearson Product-Moment correlations were used to examine the composite variables to assure that the composite variables were significantly related to each other to warrant a cannonical correlation. All of the variables were significantly correlated to one another. Though willingness to communicate had only moderate to low correlations with the apprehension dimensions.

The individual Pearson Product-Moment correlations between the individual predictor and criterion variables give further illumination to the relationships among the variables. The willingness to communicate variable was broken into three component parts of strangers, acquaintences, and friends for these examinations. Empathy was not significantly correlated with any of the predictor variables except for being willing to communicate with friends and then only slightly. Affect was not correlated with willingness to communicate with strangers, but was significantly correlated with acquaintences and friends and the significance of affect's correlation with the apprehension variables decreases as more people are added to the interaction. Affect is most significantly correlated with apprehension in dyads and not significantly correlated to it's greatest extent for apprehension for public performance. The competence dimension of social relaxation was, of course, significantly correlated to all of the apprehension and WTC dimensions. Adapatability also shows a progression towards insignificance as the number of people in an

interaction increases. It is interesting to note that there are significant correlations between relaxation and adaption with the WTC-stranger but no significant correlations for affect and empathy.

DISCUSSION

The hypothesis for this study was confirmed. A relationship seems to exist between communication apprehension, willingness to communicate, and perceptions of interpersonal communication competence. Most of the weight, however, for these relationships appears to fall with dyadic and group apprehension. Willingness to communicate appears to have an effect, but that effect is not a large one.

The competence dimension of relaxation showed the highest correlation with it's own composite as compared with the communication apprehension composite. This was not suprising considering the rationalle of the constructs involved. Adaptability was important for the apprehension dimensions of dyad, group, and meeting and for all the subcontexts for willingness to communicate. Willingness to communicate with a stranger was correlated at it's highest degree with adaptibility, implying that it may be an indicant for adaptability dimension of communication competence.

The overall varience accounted for by the apprehension and WTC composite for competence was 17 percent. Considering problems with this kind of research in the past (Daly, 1978;Jaccard & Daly, 1980) it is quite significant. Communication apprehension and willingness to communicate apparently have an effect on perceptions.

What, of course, is left open to speculation is the wide range of varience that is left unexplained. It would seem that this may be explained in terms of the context that competence may be judged within or that communication is undertaken in. The different contexts that we find ourselves, in which we

interact with others, may have a severe effect on how we are perceived. The judgements made by others on our competence may depend more upon the mutuallity or exclusivity of a context. The correlation matrix also seems to indicate that competence is somewhat dependent upon situations. The more public the context or relationship the less interpersonal competence skills correlate with apprehension or willingness to communicate variables. This may indicate that a seperate set of skills is perceived at the more public level of communication. It could also indicate that as a context becomes less private we either judge more stringently or loosely depending upon how we considered an individual to begin with. The possibility also exists that the competence instrument may lose some of its ability to measure as contexts become less interpersonal, the context for which it is primarilly designed.

Also, we could conclude from the size of the variance accounted for that our judgements of competence and the behaviors that those judgements are made upon are only moderately effected by trait-like self perception. This would seem to follow when Kelly's (1983) work is considered. As observers we do not see the internal states of the individuals that we make competence judgements on. How these states may effect another may be lost upon us when deciding whether or not an individual is competent. This brings into question the utility of self-reported trait measures in predicting human behavior. The answer may well be that they are not very utilitarian for everyday decisions or estimations of others. But the subtle and pervasive effect that they represent may help to indicate what decisions individuals make in deciding what contexts to put themselves, success in overall long term relationships, and overall happiness with life.

Future research should concentrate on what other trait-like variables contribute to more molecularized views of competence. One variable that may be

of import is how people feel about their own competence in communicating. Another important aspect to concentrate on in the future should be what effect contexts have on people as they evaluate the competence of others. Are there different dimensions of competence for different contexts or perhaps different emphasses on the dimensions of competence for different contexts. All of these are questions that should be addressed in the future.

REFERENCES

Burgoon, J. K. (1976). The unwillingness-to-communicate scale: Developement and validation. Communication Monographs, 43, 60-69.

Burgoon, J. K. & Koper, R. J. (1983). Communication reticence and relational message behavior. Paper presented at the International Communication Association convention, Dallas.

Cegala, D. J., Savage, G. T., Bruner, C.C., & Conrad, A. B. (1982). An elaboration of the meaning of interaction involvement: Toward the developement of a theoretical concept. Communication Monographs, 49, 229-248.

Daly, J. A. (1978). Communication apprehension and behavior: Applying a multiple act criteria. Human Communication Research, 4, 208-216.

Daly, J. A. & Stafford, L. (1982). Correlates and consequences of social-communicative anxiety, in J. A. Daly and J. C. McCroskey's (Eds.) Avoiding Communication: Shyness, Reticence, and Communication Apprehension, (Beverly Hills: Sage), 125-144.

Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 113-126.

Infante, D. A. & Rancer, A. S. (1982). A conceptualization and measure of arguementativeness. Journal of Personality Assessment, 46, 72-80.

Jaccard, J. & Daly, J. A. (1980). Personality traits and multiple-act criteria. Human Communication Research, 26, 36-44.

Jones, W. H. & Russell, D. W. (1982). The social reticence scale: A measure of shyness. Journal of Personality Assessment, 46, 629-631.

Kearney, P. & McCroskey, J. C. (1980). Relationships among teacher communication style, trait and state communication apprehension and teacher

effectiveness. IN D. Nimmo (Ed.) Communication Yearbook 4 (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books).

Kelly, L. (1983). Observers' comparisons of the interpersonal communication skills of reticent and non-reticent students. Communication, 12, 77-91.

Knutson, P. K. & Lashbrook, W. B. (1976). Communication apprehension as an antecedent to social style. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention, San Fransisco.

Lashbrook, W. B., Lashbrook, V. J., Bacon, C., & Salinger, S. (1979). An empirical examination of the relationship between communication apprehension and tolerance of ambiguity. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 44, 244-251.

McCroskey, J. C. (1970). Measures of communication-bound anxiety. Speech Monographs, 37, 269-277.

McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: a summary of recent theory and research. Human Communication Research, 4, 78-96.

McCroskey, J. C. (1978). Validity of the PRCA as a measure of oral communication apprehension. Communication Monographs, 45, 192-203.

McCroskey, J. C. (1981). Oral communication apprehension: Reconceptualization and a new look at measurement. Paper presented at the Central States Speech Association Convention, Chicago.

McCroskey, J. C. (1982). Oral communication apprehension: A reconceptualization. In M. Burgoon (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 6. (Beverly Hills: Sage).

McCroskey, J. C. & Baer, J. E. (1985). Willingness to communicate: The construct and it's measurement. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Denver, Colorado.

McCroskey, J. C. & McCroskey, L. L. (1986). Correlates of willingness to communicate. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Western Speech

Communication Association, Tucson, AZ.

McMroskey, J. C. & McCroskey, L. L. (1986). Predictors of willingness to communicate: Implications for screening and remediation. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

McCroskey, J. C. & Richmond, V. P. (1985). Willingness to communicate and interpersonal communication. Paper presented at the West Virginia Symposium on Personality and Interpersonal Communication, Morgantown, West Virginia.

Mortensen, D. C., Arnston, P. H., & Lustig, M. (1977). The measurement of verbal predispositions: Scale developement and application. Human Communication Research, 3, 146-158.

Pilkonis, P. (1977). The behavioral consequences of shyness. Journal of Personality, 45, 596-611.

Porter, D. T. (1982). Communicator style perceptions as a function of communication apprehension. Communication Quarterly, 30, 237-244.

Rocklin, T. & Revelle, W. (1981). The measurement of extraversion: A comparison of the Eysenck Personality Inventory and the Esyneck Personality Questionnaire. British Journal of Social Psychology, 20, 279-284.

Seiffert, M. A. (1985). Other's evaluations of communication competence as related to self evaluations of gender orientation and social style versatility. Unpublished master's thesis, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX.

Spitzberg, B. H. & Cupach, W. R. (1984). Interpersonal communication competence. Sage series in interpersonal communication(Vol. 4). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Wiemann, J. M. (1977). Explication and test of a model of communicative competence. Human Communication Research, 3, 195-213.

Wheeless, V. E. & Seiffert, M. A. (1986). Self and other perceptions of social

style as related to communication competence. Paper presented at the Eastern Communication Association Convention, Atlantic City, N.J.

Wiemann, J. M. (1977). Explication and test of a model of communicative competence. Human Communication Research, 3, 195-213.

FIGURE 1
WILLINGNESS TO COMMUNICATE SCALE

Directions: Below are 20 situations in which a person might choose to communicate or not to communicate. Presume you have completely free choice. Indicate the percentage of time you would choose to communicate in each type of situation. Indicate in the space at the left what percent of the time you would choose to communicate. 0 = never, 100 = always.

_____ 1. *Talk with a service station attendant.
_____ 2. *Talk with a physician.
_____ 3. Present a talk to a group of strangers.
_____ 4. Talk with an acquaintance while standing in line.
_____ 5. *Talk with a salesperson in a store.
_____ 6. Talk in a large meeting of friends.
_____ 7. *Talk with a policeman/policewoman.
_____ 8. Talk in a small group of strangers.
_____ 9. Talk with a friend while standing in line.
_____ 10. *Talk with a waiter/waitress in a resteraunt.
_____ 11. Talk in a large meeting of acquaintences.
_____ 12. Talk with a stranger while standing in line.
_____ 13. *Talk with a secretary.
_____ 14. Present a talk to a group of friends.
_____ 15. Talk in a small group of acquaintances.
_____ 16. *Talk with a garbage collector.
_____ 17. Talk in a large meeting of strangers.
_____ 18. *Talk with a spouse (or girl/boy friend).
_____ 19. Talk in a small group of friends.
_____ 20. Present a talk to a group of aquaintances.

* Filler Item

Scoring: To compute the subscores add the percentages for the items indicated and divide the total by three.
Stranger: 3 + 8 + 12 + 17;
Acquaintance: 4 + 11 + 15 + 20;
Friend: 6 + 9 + 14 + 19;
To compute the total WTC score, add the subscores for Stranger, Acquaintance, and Friend. The divide that total by three.

Score	Mean	Standard Deviation	Reliability
Total WTC	64.8	17.5	.89
Stranger	41.7	24.7	.87
Acquaintance	69.1	21.1	.79
Friend	83.7	16.6	.79

FIGURE 2
PERSONAL REPORT OF COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION

Directions: This instrument is composed of 24 statements concerning your feelings about communication with other people. Please indicate in the space provided the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Are Undecided, (4) Disagree, or (5) Strongly Disagree with each statement. There are no right or wrong answers. Many of the statements are similar to other statements. Do not be concerned about this. Work quickly, just record your first impression.

_____ 1. I dislike participating in group discussions.
_____ 2. Generally, I am comfortable while participating in a group discusion.
_____ 3. I am tense and nervouse while participating in group discussions.
_____ 4. I like to get involved in group discussions.
_____ 5. Engaging in a group discussion with new people makes me tense and nervous.
_____ 6. I am calm and relaxed while participating in group discussions.
_____ 7. Generally, I am nervous when I have to participate in a meeting.
_____ 8. Usually I am calm and relaxed while participating in meetings.
_____ 9. I am very calm and relaxed when I am called upon to express an opinion at a meeting.
_____ 10. I am afraid to express myself at meetings.
_____ 11. Communicating at meetings usually makes me feel uncomfortable.
_____ 12. I am very relaxed when answering questions at a meeting.
_____ 13. Ordinarily, I am very tense and nervous in conversations.
_____ 14. I have no fear of speaking up in conversations.
_____ 15. While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous.
_____ 16. While conversing with a new acquaintance, I feel very relaxed.
_____ 17. Ordinarily, I am very calm and relaxed in conversations.
_____ 18. I am afraid to speak up in conversations.
_____ 19. I have no fear of giving a speech.
_____ 20. Certain parts of my body feel very tense and rigid while giving a speech.
_____ 21. I feel relaxed while giving a speech.
_____ 22. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I am giving a speech.
_____ 23. I face the prospect of giving a speech with confidence.
_____ 24. While giving a speech I get so nervous, I forget facts I really know.

Scoring: To compute the subscores add and subtract the items indicated.
Dyad: 18 - #13 + #14 - #15 + #16 + #17 - #18;
Group: 18 - #1 + #2 -#3 + #4 -#5 + #6;
Meet: 18 - #7 + #8 + #9 - #10 - #11 + #12;
Public: 18 + #19 - #20 + #21 - #22 + #23 - #24;

Score	Mean	Standard Deviation	Reliability
Dyad	13.9	4.1	.82
Group	15.0	4.7	.86
Meet	15.4	5.0	.89
Public	19.0	5.4	.87

FIGURE 3
COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE SCALE

Below is a set of sentences that are frequently used to describe people. Indicate the degree to which the statement reflects the person who asked you to complete this form by marking whether you; 7 = Strongly Agree, 6 = Agree, 5 = Moderately Agree, 4 = Are Undecided, 3 = Moderately Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree. Record your response in the space to the left of each question. Remember, you are always making relative judgements when responding to the scales. There are no absolutes, no right answers or wrong answers. Work quickly and just record your first impression. All responses are anonymous.

____ 1. Knows when it is his or her turn to speak.
____ 2. Actively uses facial expressions.
____ 3. Listens well.
____ 4. Asks questions when talking with others.
____ 5. Argues excessively.
____ 6. Seems impatient for others to finish their remarks.
____ 7. Interrupts others.
____ 8. Times statements somewhat poorly.
____ 9. Finds it easy to play many roles--student, leader, follower, athlete, etc.
____ 10. Finds it easy to talk with all kinds of people.
____ 11. Adjusts own conversation to make others feel comfortable.
____ 12. Is behaviorally flexible.
____ 13. Is versatile in adapting to different situations.
____ 14. Often adapts his or her use of language to what others are saying.
____ 15. Discusses only a limited selection of topics.
____ 16. Does not fit in well during different social situations.
____ 17. Is not able to receive new information that is contrary to his or her values.
____ 18. Is able to recognize when people are troubled.
____ 19. People seek him or her out to tell him or her about their troubles.
____ 20. His or her personal relations are cold and distant.
____ 21. Ignores others' feelings.
____ 22. Generally knows how others feel.
____ 23. Often says "I'm sorry" when appropriate.
____ 24. Makes me feel the s/he cares about me.
____ 25. Makes embarrassing comments.
____ 26. Is not very sympathetic to the problems of others.
____ 27. Makes fun of others.
____ 28. Tries to see things from others' perspectives.
____ 29. Sounds nervous when talking to others.
____ 30. Appears quite jittery and tense in social situations.
____ 31. Is shy.
____ 32. Smiles a lot.
____ 33. Likes to use her or his voice and body expressively.
____ 34. Is quiet.
____ 35. Tends to be supportive of others.
____ 36. Often appears intimidating to other people.
____ 37. Insults others.
____ 38. Is a good listener.
____ 39. Lets others know if s/he understood them.
____ 40. Indicates support for what others say with head nods, "um-humms", and/or approving comments.

TABLE 1

Pilot Factor Structure Correlations

Questions	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
18	0.676*	-0.233	0.368	-0.230
24	0.667*	-0.226	0.481	-0.205
19	0.583*	-0.187	0.352	-0.220
22	0.570*	-0.228	0.373	-0.152
35	0.638*	-0.305	0.494	-0.153
23	0.544*	-0.256	0.392	-0.074
39	0.586*	-0.298	0.485	-0.246
38	0.611*	-0.448	0.539	-0.150
28	0.539*	-0.384	0.454	-0.181
40	0.523*	-0.265	0.478	-0.245
33	0.459*	-0.051	0.416	-0.371
5	-0.122	0.611*	-0.113	-0.004
7	-0.210	0.668*	-0.309	0.079
25	-0.242	0.648*	-0.143	0.088
6	-0.220	0.655*	-0.293	0.107
27	-0.263	0.589*	-0.116	0.065
37	-0.326	0.606*	-0.223	0.136
8	-0.257	0.607*	-0.364	0.241
36	-0.201	0.486*	-0.161	0.117
17	-0.227	0.472*	-0.249	0.280
26	-0.402	0.483*	-0.227	0.213
21	-0.488	0.475*	-0.392	0.370
12	0.490	-0.325	0.729*	-0.339
13	0.517	-0.289	0.700*	-0.314
11	0.548	-0.326	0.089	-0.270
14	0.401	-0.210	0.584	-0.195
10	0.475	-0.133	0.665	-0.520

TABLE 1 - Continued

Questions	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
3	0.554	-0.453	0.617*	-0.149
2	0.437	-0.023	0.538*	-0.359
4	0.494	-0.166	0.579*	-0.360
1	0.373	-0.381	0.423*	-0.044
9	0.487	-0.098	0.513*	-0.346
32	0.472	-0.179	0.495*	-0.365
31	-0.113	0.022	-0.213	0.684*
30	-0.215	0.293	-0.329	0.730*
29	-0.239	0.250	-0.254	0.678*
34	-0.178	0.071	-0.252	0.623*
16	-0.381	0.384	-0.418	0.523*
15 +	-0.329	0.271	-0.233	0.377
20	-0.464	0.390	-0.398	0.422*

Variable Explained by Each Factor Ignoring Other Factors

Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
7.8291	5.8564	7.5209	4.4714

Inter-Factor Correlations

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Factor 1	1.0000			
Factor 2	-0.3799	1.0000		
Factor 3	0.6116	-0.3371	1.0000	
Factor 4	-0.3187	0.1578	-0.3955	1.0000

* Item retained for factor above.
+ Item discarded from factor above.

TABLE 2

Canonical Correlation Analyses of
Variable Composites

First Canonical Root

RC	Adjusted RC	Standard Error	RC^2
0.4091	0.3842	0.0477	0.1674

Variable	r's with Composite	Weight's on Composite
Dyad	-0.8778	-0.6146
Group	-0.8401	-0.5441
Meet	-0.6808	0.1366
Public	-0.5067	-0.0836
Total WTC	0.4603	0.1102
Affect	0.3692	-0.3975
Empathy	0.2238	0.1273
Adapt	0.6377	0.5246
Relax	0.9450	0.8294

Multivariate Statistics and F Approximations

Statistic	Value	F	DF	p
Wilk's Lambda	0.7908	3.60	20/983	.0001
Pillai's Trace	0.2180	3.44	20/1196	.0001
Hotelling-Lawley Trace	0.2533	3.73	20/1178	.0001
Roy's Greatest Root	0.2011	12.02	5/299	.0001

TABLE 3

Correlations Among Variables (N = 305)

Variable	DYAD 1	GROUP 2	MEET 3	PUBLIC 4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Dyad	1.00											
2. Group	0.51	1.00										
3. Meet	0.53	0.73	1.00									
4. Public	0.30	0.46	0.60	1.00								
5. Total WTC	-0.23	-0.42	-0.24	-0.24	1.00							
6. Affect	-0.12	-0.12	0.01*	0.01*	0.13	1.00						
7. Empathy	-0.06*	-0.07*	-0.05*	-0.03*	0.09*	0.50	1.00					
8. Adapt	-0.23	-0.19	-0.12	-0.05*	0.20	0.78	0.36	1.00				
9. Relax	-0.33	-0.34	-0.27	-0.20	0.14	0.35	0.12	0.45	1.00			
10. Stranger	-0.26	-0.36	-0.35	-0.31	0.83	0.06*	0.04*	0.16	0.12	1.00		
11. Acquaintance	-0.17	-0.36	-0.30	-0.17	0.88	0.14	0.08*	0.18	0.11	0.56	1.00	
12. Friend	-0.14	-0.33	-0.21	-0.06*	0.79	0.14	0.12	0.18	0.11	0.42	0.69	1.00

*Not Significant, $p > .05$.

Remainder of r's significant, $p < .05$.